

the United States has the energy we need to fuel our economy.

I thank the Chair. I thank my friend from Maine for allowing me additional time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS and Mr. KERRY pertaining to the introduction of S. 162 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

#### A REPORT ON FOREIGN TRAVEL

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, in the absence of any other Senator on the floor, I think this would be an appropriate time to report on some foreign travel which I recently undertook for a 2-week period in late December and early January, accompanied on part of the trip by Senator VOINOVICH. Our trip took us to the Mideast, where we had the opportunity to confer with Egyptian President Mubarak, and then in Israel, Prime Minister Barak, and Minister Ariel Sharon, who was contesting for the post of Prime Minister in an election to be held in Israel on February 6; and also former Foreign Minister Shimon Peres.

I then continued on to Aqaba in Jordan and had the opportunity to meet with King Abdullah in Jordan.

We found the Mideast to be very tense, with the exacerbation of violence inspired by Palestinian youth. The Palestinian Authority has not observed their obligation under the Oslo accords to have an educational system which omits the traditional incitement to violence of youngsters. Their educational materials in the sixth grade, seventh grade, ninth grade and beyond, urges the young people to engage in violence—a holy jihad for the glory of Allah—encouraging acts which result in their own deaths as martyrs. That has set into motion a sequence of events in the area where the violence has just been extraordinary.

I think we are really looking at a generational problem—perhaps more than a generational problem—until there is some recognition that the Israelis and Palestinians can live side by side under the terms of the Oslo accords and the implementation, as may be worked out.

When we were there, and to this day, the atmosphere was heavy with doubts as to whether a peace treaty could be reached.

I have complimented President Clinton privately and publicly, and I do so again today, for the efforts he maintained right to the end of his term in office. Now the new administration, I know, will pick up this very difficult issue and will work as best they can to implement the peace process and try to bring stability to that region.

Before traveling to Egypt and Israel, Senator VOINOVICH and I visited Belgrade in Yugoslavia and made a trip into Bosnia. We were enormously impressed with the U.S. military presence in Bosnia, and U.S. soldiers helping to maintain a very fragile peace in that area of the world.

In Yugoslavia, we met the new leaders, who are very impressive men who are carrying forward.

The problem of former President Milosevic is a very big issue in Yugoslavia. The new Yugoslav leaders say they want to try him in Yugoslavia, as he has committed horrendous crimes against the people of Yugoslavia—embezzlement which is estimated as high as \$1 billion, and stealing the election on election fraud. But at the same time, there are competing demands from the War Crimes Tribunal at The Hague.

On my return trip, after Senator VOINOVICH had departed in Israel, I had the chance to meet with the chief prosecutor of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, Carla del Ponte, at The Hague. She is insistent on bringing Milosevic to trial at The Hague.

Under the U.N. resolution, there is a priority status accorded to The Hague to try Milosevic.

Perhaps these interests can be reconciled by trying Milosevic first in Yugoslavia, but before he serves a sentence if one is imposed, he goes to The Hague for trial. Ms. del Ponte was concerned that there not be a long interval because the War Crimes Tribunal is a temporary institution. There have been some suggestions that Milosevic be tried by the War Crimes Tribunal in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, but that remains to be worked out.

One thing which must be accomplished, in my judgment, is that Milosevic must be tried and brought to justice. It is enormously important that a head of state be tried.

I note my distinguished colleague, Senator GRASSLEY, has arrived on the floor, so I will conclude these remarks with a comment or two on the discussions which were held with the leaders in India and in Pakistan where there has been a problem of nuclear confrontation and the dispute in Kashmir. There were also discussions on the persecution of Christians, which is a very rampant problem.

Mr. President, on December 28, Senator VOINOVICH and I departed from Andrews Air Force Base and flew across the Atlantic landing late in the evening in Munich, Germany. Consul General Bob Boehme and Economic Officer John McCaslin met us in Munich. The two shared with us their thoughts on a wide variety of subjects ranging from a potential U.S. missile defense system to the current refugee situation in Germany. The next morning we had a working breakfast with representa-

tives of the German/American business community. Our discussions ranged from lack of an educated workforce in Germany resulting in the need for skilled immigrants to staff many of their high-tech companies to harmonization of a European defense force with NATO to the ever-evolving situation in the Balkans. After our breakfast we departed Munich and arrived in Belgrade, Yugoslavia on Friday December 29.

My first visit to Yugoslavia was in 1986, when I visited with then President Moisev. I was last in Belgrade in August 1998 in an attempt to visit then President Slobodan Milosevic to urge him to turn over indicted war criminals. Yugoslavia today is a country undergoing dramatic changes. Recently and most notably is the formation of a democratic form of government. The greatest political achievement of the Serbian people was a peaceful democratic revolution. Public protests usually happen before elections are held when the political tensions are at their greatest. In Yugoslavia, the opposite happened. Mass protests were the only way to guarantee that the popular will expressed at the polls was to be respected by former President Milosevic.

The transfer of power following the electoral victory has not been simple, primarily because of Mr. Milosevic's attempts to falsify obvious electoral results. With widespread support from the citizens, the Democratic Opposition of Serbia secured the recognition of the electoral results and Dr. Kostunica was declared head of state on October 5, 2000. However, full legal transfer of power was not fully accomplished by this proclamation. President Kostunica has insisted on a strict observance of the rule of law. The immediate challenge ahead for President Kostunica and the Federal Government includes dealing in a clear and transparent way with relations in the Yugoslav federation and, in Serbia, resolving the political and security issues related to Kosovo. After my discussions with the various officials from the Serbian and Yugoslav Government, it was clear there is a strong desire for Mr. Milosevic to be tried by the Serbian government and be held to pay for what he has done to the Serbian people before they were willing to turn him over to the officials at The Hague.

We were met at the airport by U.S. Ambassador Bill Montgomery and proceeded to our first meeting with Mr. Vojislav Kostunica, President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Sen. VOINOVICH and I were the first Congressional leaders to meet with the newly elected President and we congratulated him on his monumental victory. President Kostunica proudly told us that after the recent December 23 elections, democratic party candidates won 176 out of 250 seats in Parliament, Yugoslavia was now ready to push forward with reform. Unfortunately, the new

democratic Yugoslavia is now having to pay for ten years of corruption and mismanagement under the Milosevic regime. Basic public services and health care are lacking as well as energy production resulting in rolling blackouts in Belgrade during the time of our visit. Another internal problem facing the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is a political problem—dealing with the integration of Serbia and Montenegro. President Djukanovic of Montenegro has declared that Montenegro should be a separate state loosely aligned with Yugoslavia while Mr. Zoran Djindjic of Serbia, expected to be Prime Minister, desires a more traditional federal alliance with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

During our discussion, I told President Kostunica that I thought Slobodan Milosevic should be turned over to the prosecutors at the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia at The Hague for prosecution. President Kostunica told me that while he agreed that Slobodan Milosevic should be held accountable, the Serbian people should first be given the opportunity to prosecute Mr. Milosevic for his many transgressions against them, such as stealing the September elections and stealing approximately \$1 billion from the coffers of the Yugoslav government. President Kostunica was quick to point out that he welcomed the office of The Hague Tribunal, which had recently reopened in Belgrade, as the first step in the eventual investigation and prosecution of Mr. Milosevic and also other indicted war criminals who were seeking safe harbor in Yugoslavia.

We then met with Professor Miroljub Labus, the Federal Deputy Prime Minister in charge of economic policy as well as Mr. Bozidar Djelic, the Serbian Minister of Finance. Professor Labus as well as Minister Djelic, both were emphatic in their desire to bring pro market, transparent transactions to the economy of both the federal republic of Yugoslavia as well as Serbia. Two of the major moves the federal government had undertaken that week was to cut defense spending in order to direct more money into infrastructure repairs which had been badly neglected under the Milosevic regime and deregulate foreign trade in order to attract more overseas investment. Both felt that while the new democratic government had a good deal of support of the people behind them, they only had about 3 to 6 months to help get the government on the right track since the people were expecting to demand results soon.

We next met Mr. Zoran Djindjic who won his election only 6 days prior to our arrival. He told us that while he had won the political battle, the battle to undertake the reforms the people of Serbia demanded was just beginning. He said that for the past 50 years the government of Serbia had been a fa-

cade and that he intended to have a transparent, functioning democratic government. When we discussed Mr. Milosevic being tried at The Hague, he said Mr. Milosevic was merely a small time criminal but had been in the position to have the opportunity to commit big time crimes. He further said the will of the Serbian people was to try Mr. Milosevic in the Serbian courts first. On the topic of Montenegro, he said that integration into the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was imperative for the establishment of joint institution of government so that Yugoslavia could begin to slowly move towards gaining membership into the EU.

On the morning of December 30, we met with His Holiness Paul, Patriarch of the Serbian Orthodox Church. The elderly Patriarch was a distinguished looking gentleman who served as a priest in Kosovo for 34 years. The Patriarch felt that while the Serbians had done many things wrong during the recent conflicts, others did as well, and the unfortunate result was that many ancient churches and mosques were senselessly and unnecessarily destroyed. The Patriarch stated that he felt that the Church had assisted in highlighting moral issues during the elections and the Church had always advocated peaceful solutions and a peaceful transfer of power.

After our meeting with the Patriarch we flew to Bosnia to meet soldiers from the multinational peace keeping force in Tuzla. Major General Sharp, Commander of the 3rd Infantry Division, headquartered in Tuzla, Bosnia met us at the airport. General Sharp commands over 3900 American soldiers, which help constitute a combined force of over 6700 soldiers including those from Russia, Denmark, Poland, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Sweden and Turkey. We discussed his soldier's mission, which was supporting implementation of the Dayton Peace Accords and maintaining force protection awareness in the region. We discussed the problem of war criminals and he said that he knew of no indicted war criminals in his area of responsibility but that the orders for his division were to detain and hold any of the personnel that had been indicted for war crimes. We also discussed the increasing role of the National Guard in the peacekeeping role in the Balkans and the fact that Pennsylvania's 29th Infantry Division will be taking over that critical peace keeping mission there in 2002.

We then flew by UH-60 Blackhawk helicopters from Tuzla to Camp Dobol to visit with some of the soldiers who are stationed there. During lunch we discussed many issues with the soldiers ranging from the need to continue to reform Tri-Care to the transferability of a soldiers GI bill to his family members. After having lunch we departed in Humvee's and went on a patrol through

the towns of Flipovici and Katonovici with the soldiers of the 3rd Infantry Division.

Upon returning from Tuzla late in the afternoon, we met with Yugoslav Minister of Justice Momcilo Grubac who told us that the new Yugoslav state would be formed under the rule of law and the massive legal reform was just beginning. The Minister told us that they were working on harmonizing existing Yugoslav law with EU law in order to comply with international standards and to attract overseas investment and provide legal and economic stability. When we discussed the trial of Mr. Milosevic, the Minister of Justice felt strongly that Milosevic should first be tried and held accountable in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia before being turned over and tried in The Hague. The Minister of Justice said a new prosecutor for the City of Belgrade would be responsible for trying Milosevic. The current DA was a holdover from a Milosevic government and until December parliamentary elections could not have been removed. The Minister anticipated that in late January or early February the DA would be replaced with one that would be able to prosecute Milosevic.

Later that evening we met with Professor Dragoljub Micunovic, the President of the Federal Parliaments Chamber of Citizens "the Republic's Upper Body" and his colleagues. We met in the same Parliament building that we all saw on CNN only a few months earlier being stormed by citizens demanding fair counting of the elected results. These same citizens then were hanging out of windows waving the Yugoslav flag after they were successful in forcing Mr. Milosevic to declare President Kostunica the rightful winner of the federal elections. The Parliamentarians told us that they felt they had laid a successful groundwork for reform and that now it was time for them to deliver. They, like all the other officials we talked to in Yugoslavia, felt that Mr. Milosevic should be first tried in Yugoslavia. We were told that they were sure that the prisons in Serbia were much less comfortable than those in The Hague and thus Mr. Milosevic would face a much harsher sentence in Serbia. After serving his time in Serbia, they agreed it would be possible for him to go to The Hague to be tried.

On New Years Eve we departed Belgrade for Cairo, Egypt. In Cairo that evening, we met with Ambassador Daniel Kurtzer to discuss the status of the negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. My first meeting with Ambassador Kurtzer occurred on January 7, 1998, his second day in Egypt.

On New Years Day we visited with President Mubarak at Itihadiya Palace in Heiliopolis. As always, the President was gracious as he rearranged his busy

schedule in order to meet with our delegation. President Mubarak and I discussed the negotiations between Chairman Arafat, Prime Minister Barak and President Clinton. When we asked President Mubarak when the Egyptian Ambassador would be returned to Israel, he said the withdrawal of his did not lessen diplomatic contacts between Egypt and Israel and should not be construed as his lack of support for comprehensive peace between the Palestinians and the Israelis.

President Mubarak said he felt that there was no pressure to conclude talks because of President Clinton's departure or because of Prime Minister Barak's upcoming election. I asked President Mubarak if he would be willing to participate at the negotiations in Washington. President Mubarak said that he did not feel that it would be helpful to negotiate along-side Chairman Arafat, Prime Minister Barak and President Clinton as the issues really need to be resolved between Barak and Arafat on their own.

President Mubarak said that the younger leaders in the region—The King of Jordan, the King of Morocco, and Crown-prince of Bahrain—were all bright stars on the horizon in the region and could be counted on to be supportive of the peace process.

We discussed the problem of persecution of religious minorities with President Mubarak. Egypt, a Muslim country, also has a large vocal Christian community which is comprised of Copts and Evangelicals. I had previously discussed the plight of religious minorities with President Mubarak in February of 1998, in January of 1999, and again in September of 1999. I was informed on my previous trips as well as back in Washington that both the Copts and other religious minorities faced wide-spread discrimination and persecution sometimes rising to the level of violence. President Mubarak assured Senator VOINOVICH and me that the Egyptian government would not tolerate such activity. We discussed the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 with President Mubarak who downplayed the significance of the Act in Egypt. He said there was no need for its application because his government would not tolerate religious persecution and that any incidents that did occur were undertaken on an isolated basis and investigated by the government.

At mid morning on New Years day, we departed from Cairo and flew to Tel Aviv. Upon reaching Jerusalem, we were briefed by Ambassador Martin Indyk and headed off to our first meeting at the Knesset with former Prime Minister Shimon Peres. Former Prime Minister Peres was under the impression that there was not sufficient time to conclude the compressive negotiations between the Palestinians and Israelis before the upcoming elec-

tions in Israel on February 6 and the end of President Clinton's term. In Prime Minister Peres' opinion, there was not enough focus on the economic issues surrounding a comprehensive peace plan. The former Prime Minister held the common opinion that the major stumbling blocks to the current negotiations were Jerusalem, the holy sites and the Palestinian claim to a right of return. He emphasized that there could be no Israeli concession on the right of return without endangering the continuation of a "Jewish state" which was the fundamental reason for the creation of Israel after the Holocaust.

Our next meeting was with Prime Minister Barak whose frustration with negotiations was palpable. Barak stated that he had been very flexible in his negotiations with Arafat and that Arafat had taken no risks in the positions he was articulating. He stated that the continuing violence between the Palestinians and Israeli's lead to unrest in the region and did not help the current peace with Egypt and Jordan. The Prime Minister reminded us that last year was the best year in the history of Israel for Israel's economy. Prime Minister Barak stated that the only reason he had not already ended his negotiations with Arafat was to give President Clinton, who had personally invested so much in the negotiations, one last chance to broker peace in the region.

Our final meeting on New Years day was with Minister Ariel Sharon. Minister Sharon said that his much maligned visit to the Temple Mount served only as an excuse for the Palestinians by which to mount violence against the Israeli people. He stated that he had visited the Temple Mount a number of times in the past without incident. Minister Sharon told us, if elected as Prime Minister on February 6, he would be willing to immediately talk to Arafat about continued negotiations. Minister Sharon said he was astounded that Prime Minister Barak was willing to "give away" Jerusalem and the holy sites without any debate or discussion with the people of Israel.

He felt that the problems of Jerusalem, ensuring there are adequate security zones inside Israel, and the return of refugees were the major stumbling blocks to peace. Minister Sharon said although he was a General, he was committed to peace, not war. He recounted how he started as a young private in the Israeli Defense Force and rose to the level of General, fighting in every battle in the history of the State of Israel. He said that he had experienced all the horrors of war that he had seen many of his friends killed and wounded and was in fact twice wounded himself and therefore he understood, perhaps more than most, the importance of peace. However, he said, negotiating peace for Israel was almost as

painful as war because peace means security for Israel and it was something that he was not going to undertake lightly.

At the conclusion of that day after meeting with President Mubarak, Prime Minister Barak, former Prime Minister Peres and Minister Sharon, Senator VOINOVICH and I decided to send telefaxes to the leaders of Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Morocco and Tunisia, as well as President Mubarak, urging them to publicly express their support for President Clinton's proposal. The letter stated:

We are advised that you think President Clinton's suggested parameters for the Israeli-Palestinian peace negotiation is a reasonable proposal and should be accepted by both sides. If that is true, we urge you to say so publicly to demonstrate there is support in the Arab world to encourage Chairman Arafat to give President Clinton an affirmative reply promptly.

Later that evening I departed Tel Aviv and flew to Aqaba, Jordan. Senator VOINOVICH stayed in Israel and had a separate schedule for the balance of his trip.

I met with King Abdullah in his summer palace on January 2. I had previously met with the King's father for many years. King Abdullah said that he had found President Clinton's peace proposals to be very reasonable and that he had encouraged Chairman Arafat to use the proposal as a framework from which to build a comprehensive peace. The King and I discussed whether or not he believed that Chairman Arafat had control of the street violence and protest in Israel, and King Abdullah opined that he believed that at the outset of the Intifada, Arafat had more control but recently the influence of the Islamic Jihad and Hamas were on the rise. I discussed with the King the possibility of other Arab countries using their influence to publicly persuade Arafat that the Clinton peace proposal was something that should be seriously considered. King Abdullah stated that President Mubarak had by far the most influence on Chairman Arafat. King Abdullah thought that he along with the Crown Prince of Bahrain, President Ben-Ali of Tunisia, President Mubarak of Egypt, and King Mohamed of Morocco would consider publicly supporting the Clinton peace proposal.

Later that afternoon we departed for New Delhi. We arrived in New Delhi at 10:15 p.m. and Albert Thibault, the Deputy Chief of Mission and Paul Mailhot, First Secretary, met us at the airport. The following morning we had a working breakfast meeting with members from the U.S. Embassy. At the briefing, we discussed the current issues that were of concern to India including the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), India-Pakistan relations, and the future of U.S.-India relations under the Bush Administration. President Clinton's visit

in March of 2000 was the first Presidential visit since President Carter's visit to India. The main focus of our discussions was the relationship between India and Pakistan.

My first meeting that morning was with Foreign Secretary Lalit Mansingh. I congratulated Foreign Secretary Mansingh on his designation as the next Indian ambassador to the U.S. We spoke briefly about the elections in the U.S. and the Foreign Secretary asked me if I thought that the election would result in some momentum for reform of our system of voting. I responded that reform was on the horizon but that the electoral college would not be eliminated. On the issue of the CTBT, the Foreign Secretary expressed his sentiment that the U.S. should not expect India to sign a Treaty that the U.S. itself perceives as flawed. He went on to state that the Indian neighborhood was getting more dangerous and that India had no choice but to "go nuclear" to protect itself against both China and Pakistan "but we want to convince you that India is a responsible country." I then posed the question to him of what his assessment was of the likelihood was that a nation, excepting those classified as so-called rogue nations, would launch an attack against another country. The foreign secretary promptly responded that unless there was an "act of madness", one does not anticipate nuclear attacks from democratic regime. India, he said, is producing thousands of graduates every year, whereas Pakistan is producing thousands of terrorists each year. He went on to express his concern about the role of Pakistan in fostering religious fervor, which manifested themselves into acts of terrorism.

The Foreign Secretary stressed that India shared the United States commitment to reducing nuclear weapons, but have not always agreed in how to reach this common goal. The United States believes that India should forego nuclear weapons. India believes that it needs to maintain a credible minimum nuclear deterrent in keeping with its own assessment of its security needs. Nonetheless, he said, India would be prepared to work with the U.S. to build upon the bilateral dialogue already underway.

Next, I asked the Foreign Secretary the impact of the religious persecution legislation that was enacted in law in 1998. He responded that the legislation had no impact because there is no real problem with discrimination in India. When I asked him what steps the Indian government had taken to protect minority communities and prosecute offenders, the Foreign Secretary responded that there had been isolated incidences in the remote tribal areas of Orissa and Gujarat and that the Government had strongly condemned these murders. Prime Minister Vajpayee had

committed that reducing communal violence was one of the main goals of his government and in that light he had spent last week in the state of Kerala focuses on the issue. He went on to note that many religious minorities held seats in Parliament including Defense Minister George Fernandes.

That afternoon, Ambassador Celeste hosted a luncheon at his residence with leaders from the business, civil, political and philanthropic communities. We discussed a wide range of issues ranging from brain drain in India to the middle-east peace process.

My next meeting that afternoon was with the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House of Parliament Dr. Manmohan Singh. Dr. Manmohan Singh was also Finance Minister under former Prime Minister Narashima Rao and the architect of India's economic reform program in the early 1990's. We discussed topics ranging from the continued strengthening of U.S.-India ties under the Bush Administration to the perseverance of India's economic liberalization. When Dr. Singh asked me about my general views on South Asia, I told him that I believed that with a population of over 1 billion, one fifth of the world's population, India has a lot of unrealized potential. I told him that I applauded India's move from a socialist economy to a free market economy and its achievements in science and technology. He said that India is committed to economic expansion and reform—especially in the emerging knowledge-based industries and high-technology areas, and it is determined to bring the benefits of economic growth to all its people.

My final meeting that evening was with K. Natwar Singh, who is the chief foreign policy advisor to Congress Party President Sonia Gandhi. Mr. Singh also served as foreign minister under Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, Sonia Gandhi's late husband. We met in the room that used to serve as the late Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's office. Mr. Singh took me to the memorial, which marked the spot that on October 31, 1984, while walking to her office from her nearby residence, Indira Gandhi was assassinated.

We discussed issues ranging from the middle east peace process to the balance of power in the newly elect 50-50 Senate to India-Pakistan relationship. Mr. Singh expressed the belief of his party that reestablishing a bilateral dialogue with Pakistan is critical if any progress is to be made in the Kashmir region. I told him that following my visit to the subcontinent in 1995, I wrote a letter to President Clinton summarizing my meetings with then Prime Minister Rao and Prime Minister Bhutto and suggesting that it would be very productive for the United States to initiate and broker discussions between India and Pakistan regarding nuclear weapons and missile delivery systems.

When I raised the issue of persecution of religious minorities, he responded that there is no state sponsored discrimination, but there had been isolated case by case incidents. Mr. Singh expressed to me that these were isolated incidents and that the government had strongly condemned the attacks. He informed me that Prime Minister Vajpayee personally was distressed over these attacks and had just returned from meeting with a group of Christian Bishops in the state of Kerala.

The following day I attended a luncheon meeting with the Confederation of Indian Industry. Approximately 40 business leaders participated in a lively question and answer session where I responded to wide array of questions about from bipartisanship in the newly elected Senate, the U.S. economy, China PNTR and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

I left the luncheon and arrived at the Mother Child Welfare Center in Chanakyapuri, New Delhi. This Welfare Center also serves as the local polio immunization clinic. Launched in 1988, the global Polio Eradication Initiative is spearheaded by the U.S. Center for Disease Control and Prevention, WHO, Rotary International, National Governments and UNICEF. The Governments of the United States, Denmark, Germany, Italy, Japan, UK, the European Commission, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, and the UN Foundation and the World Bank have all been supporting the effort to eradicate polio in India by 2002. This would be only the second disease to be eradicated after small pox. Here, I had the opportunity to hold and administer the polio vaccine drops to the infants at the clinic.

Later that afternoon, I met with Foreign Minister Jaswant Singh. We discussed India signing the CTBT, FMCT—Fissile Material Production Treaty which would end the production of nuclear materials—India's nuclear weapons program, Kashmir, the problems in Afghanistan with the Taliban. He told me that India was committed towards any hostility in the region and that the CTBT was a meaningless Treaty in their eyes because they have already taken on a voluntary moratorium. He went on to stress that India recently signed a treaty with Pakistan that recently no aggressive use of nuclear weapons.

The next morning we departed for Udaipur. That afternoon I met with Professor P.C. Bordia, an expert on India's licit opium production program. India is the world's largest source of opium for pharmaceutical use. However, located between Afghanistan and Burma, the two main world sources of illicitly grown opium, India is a transit point for heroin. Opium is produced legally in India under strict licensing and control, and the Government of India tries to extract every gram from

the cultivators. The United States and India signed an agreement in June 2000 to jointly survey and study samples of licit opium poppy crop. Professor Bordia explained to me the methodology of the three year study. This collaborative DEA funded project seeks to produce reliable data on the yields of opium gum from India's poppy cultivation, which would help the Government of India to maintain tight control over its licit poppy production to prevent diversion and ensure an adequate supply to meet the international medical and scientific needs. The project is scheduled to begin in mid-January 2001 with the visit of two U.S. scientists, Drs. Basil and Mary Acock.

Later that afternoon, my staff toured the Udaipur Solar Observatory GONG project—Global Oscillation Network Group—which has been funded by the National Science Foundation for the last nine years. The GONG project is an international project conducting a detailed study of the internal structure and motions of the Sun using helioseismology. The U.S. National Observatory developed GONG stations in six stations all over the world. These are in Hawaii, California, Chile, Canary Island, India and Australia, and the National Solar Observatory in Tucson, Arizona. Dr. Arvind Bhatnagar and Dr. S.C. Tripathy explained that this project enables surveillance of the Sun 24 hours a day. My staff saw first hand the working of the sophisticated \$1.5 million state of the art telescope that has been installed in Udaipur under this project. This telescope monitors the Sun automatically, and takes digital velocity images of the sun every minute. This data is then combined with the data from the other five sites at the central facility located in Tucson. Dr. Bhatnagar explained to my staff with tremendous enthusiasm that the GONG project promises to unravel several fundamental problems of solar interior and general astrophysics.

On Sunday, January 7, prior to departing for Islamabad from New Delhi, I met with the Station Chief and agents in-charge of the FBI and DEA in New Delhi.

That same morning I also met with Dr. John Fitzsimmons and Dr. Gary Hlady to discuss the National Polio Surveillance Project and to see what might be done to expand that program to cover other illnesses such as measles, rubella, tetanus etc. They told me that polio eradication within Asia was within reach by the year 2002 and that measles was on the horizon. We also discussed ways in which Congress could assist the CDC and NIH to develop programs targeted at eradicating these diseases.

It was apparent by comments in both India and Pakistan that the Senate's 1999 vote against ratifying the CTBT was closely watched and that the vote diluted our power to persuade nations

like India and Pakistan to support the CTBT. In my discussions with officials, it became evident that securing compliance with the CTBT by these two nations without U.S. ratification would be problematic.

We departed New Delhi on the morning of January 7 traveled to Islamabad, Pakistan. I last visited Pakistan in 1995 meeting with then Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto who is now living abroad in exile and facing corruption charges in Pakistan. Upon our arrival, the Charge, Michele Sison, met me at the airport and we departed for our first meeting. General Musharraf, the Chief Executive and current political leader of Pakistan as well as the foreign minister, were out of the country on foreign travel.

Our first meeting was with the Foreign Secretary, Inam ul-Haq. Secretary Ul-Haq is Pakistan's highest-ranking career diplomat having previously been posted as Pakistan's Ambassador to the United Nations and as Pakistan's Ambassador to China. Our meeting began with a discussion of Pakistan's nuclear tests and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). The Foreign Secretary told me that General Musharraf and the current government was in favor of ratification of the CTBT. However, I was told that there was a very vocal group in Pakistan which was opposed to Pakistan's ratification of the Treaty and that the Foreign Minister was personally working on persuading opponents of the Treaty and its benefits. The foreign secretary informed me that the Pakistani government closely followed the limited debate and vote in the U.S. Senate regarding the CTBT and that ratification by the U.S. would be very helpful in Pakistan's internal debate on the issue.

I next discussed the procedure by which General Musharraf came to be the current political leader of Pakistan. I was told that after the General's ouster of Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif and ascension to power, a lawsuit was filed against the General in the Supreme Court challenging the legitimacy of his actions. When I asked if the outcome of that suit was predetermined, the foreign secretary informed me that there was a similar situation when a previous General had ousted a previous Prime Minister and a lawsuit was filed challenging the legitimacy of the action. The Supreme Court in that case found the General's actions to be unjustified and returned the Prime Minister to power. I told the Foreign Secretary of the great concern in the United States Congress regarding the return of democracy to Pakistan and that I was hopeful General Musharraf would honor the October 2002 Supreme Court deadline for restoring democracy.

Our discussion then turned to Kashmir and the ongoing conflict there. The

Foreign Secretary stated that his government was pleased with the easing of tensions and was hopeful, but not optimistic, that the Indian government would engage in dialogue regarding Kashmir.

I asked the Foreign Secretary what could or should be done with the Taliban and Osama Bin Laden in Afghanistan. The Foreign Secretary told me that Undersecretary of State Pickering had conducted meetings with officials from the Taliban and that they were very grateful for the support of the U.S. provided during their war with the former Soviet Union. The Foreign Secretary felt that the U.S. should continue to provide humanitarian aid to Afghanistan and that perhaps through dialogue with the Taliban some solution regarding Osama Bin Laden could be reached. The Foreign Secretary thought that more sanctions would do more harm than good. The Foreign Secretary told me that Pakistan suffered from more terrorist attacks than any other country and that combating terrorism in Afghanistan worked to Pakistan's benefit as well.

Finally, we discussed the situation facing religious minorities in Pakistan. Pakistan is a predominately Muslim country with roughly 90 percent of its population belonging to that religion. The remaining religious minorities are roughly 3 percent Hindu, 6 percent Christian and 1 percent Sikh. The major problem facing non-Muslims in Pakistan is the blasphemy law, which allows for the death of anyone who blasphemes the Prophet Mohammed. I was told that the interpretation of the law is very liberal and mere attendance of mass by Catholics is a sufficient basis on which to charge someone for the crime. I urged the Foreign Secretary to have his government repeal this law and play a more active role in the protection of religious minorities.

After my meeting with the foreign secretary, we attended a working reception at the Charge's home in Islamabad. The attendees at the reception were leaders from the Government, the Academy, various NGOs, religious and American communities. During the course of the evening, we engaged in spirited debate on topics such as the CTBT, missile defense, religious tolerance and the importance of democracy.

The next morning I had the opportunity to sit down with Mr. Shahbaz Bhatti, Founder and President of the Christian Liberation Front of Pakistan whom I had met in Philadelphia earlier this year. His group is an umbrella organization whose self described mission is the "liberation of the oppressed from social subjugation, economic deprivation, religious discrimination, religious intolerance and expression." Mr. Bhatti and I discussed Pakistan's blasphemy law, which he told me is broadly interpreted, and states that anyone

who blasphemes the Prophet Mohamed is to be sentenced to death. Mr. Bhatti told me that there were many individuals currently being detained in Pakistani jails under the law and he provided me with a list of names. I asked Mr. Bhatti if he thought that the religious persecution act the Congress had passed had any effect on his situation in Pakistan.

He told me that he thought the Act was a useful instrument for the enhancement of interfaith harmony and religious tolerance, not only in Pakistan, but also all over the world. Mr. Bhatti told me that he felt that the U.S. State Department needed to be more focused on persecution in Pakistan in the coming year. Mr. Bhatti said that while he had met with the U.S. Ambassador when he had visited Pakistan and that he had met with the Ambassador again in Washington, he felt that Pakistan should be elevated to a country of special concern in the State Department's annual report. Mr. Bhatti felt that Islamic militants inside Pakistan were pressuring the government to be even less tolerant of religious minorities. Mr. Bhatti told me that he had received telephonic threats at his home and that vandals had done property damage to his office. He told me that he had a meeting with General Musharraf to discuss religious tolerance and while the General seemed to be genuinely concerned about the plight of the religious minorities, he told Mr. Bhatti that he had to deal with a constituency, which did not share his tolerant views.

After my discussion with Mr. Bhatti I called the Foreign Secretary to discuss the plight of the religious minorities and the detention of certain individuals under the blasphemy law. The Foreign Secretary told me that he would look into the matter and I told him I would send him a list of those imprisoned because of their religion which Mr. Bhatti provided me.

We departed Islamabad and arrived into Istanbul on the night of January 8. The next morning we had a working breakfast with the Ambassador, his wife, Station Chief and the regional head of the DEA. Our discussions at breakfast covered a wide range of issues from resolution of Turkey's long-standing conflict with Cyprus, Syrian-Turkish relations, Turkey's entry into the European Union, and the strong political and military ties between Turkey and the United States.

After departing Istanbul, we traveled to Mons, Belgium to meet with General Ralston, the Supreme Allied Commander of all NATO forces in Europe. General Ralston and I discussed the United States' proposed National Missile Defense System and the views our European allies had of that plan. General Ralston told me that he felt that the European's felt vulnerable to strategic missile attack under the U.S.

plan which just proposed to protect the United States. We discussed the stand-alone European Defense force in addition to NATO. General Ralston had high praise for NATO's new members, Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary and in fact was headed to the Czech Republic that afternoon.

General Ralston told me that his forces were ready, willing and able to assist the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) in effectuating the arrest and return to The Hague of persons indicted for war crimes as soon as his political leadership instructed him to do so.

After our meeting with General Ralston, we traveled to The Hague to meet with the Chief Prosecutor of the ICTY, Carla del Ponte, and some of her staff. She expressed her strong sentiment to me that Slobodan Milosevic must be returned to The Hague for trial at the ICTY before standing trial in Belgrade. Madam del Ponte felt very strongly about Milosevic being brought to trial in Belgrade for a number of reasons. First of all, she said, the ICTY had a clear mandate and enjoyed primacy over domestic courts—this was a Security Council mandate. Secondly, she expressed her fear that the Milosevic regime would still retain some power—even behind the scenes—for a long time; Further, she stressed that The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia must first establish its credibility before it takes on the daunting task of judging a former President. She said that the whole basis of the ICTY was to tackle those difficult, painful cases for which domestic courts are ill-equipped. I told the Chief Prosecutor that I shared her desire to have Mr. Milosevic prosecuted at The Hague but was doubtful that Mr. Milosevic would be turned over to The Hague after my recent meeting in Belgrade.

The Chief Prosecutor and I also discussed the ongoing negotiations to establish an International Criminal Court and the concerns surrounding such a body. I told her that there were concerns in the United States Congress regarding the vulnerability of U.S. servicemen of being subjected to charges that are purely politically motivated and had no basis in fact. We discussed her consideration of requests by Russia and Yugoslavia under Milosevic to charge NATO officials with war crimes. Madam del Ponte told me that as a prosecutor she had no discretion in the matter and that, as a matter of course, she had to investigate the charges which she eventually deemed to be without merit.

I asked Madam del Ponte if the ICTY needed any additional resources. She told me that resources continued to be tight—stressing that there was a great deal of work to do collecting evidence of the war crimes and that additional resources would be beneficial.

My next meeting was with ICTY Judge Patricia Wald who resigned from

the federal judiciary to serve at The Hague. We discussed the functioning and legal rules of the ICTY. Judge Wald informed me that the ICTY bench consists of members from the U.S., England, France, Australia, Portugal, Italy, China, Vienna, Malaysia, Zambia, Colombia, Jamaica and Egypt.

My meetings with Chief Prosecutor Carla del Ponte and Judge Pat Wald, following on my earlier meetings in Belgrade, supported my notion that bringing Milosevic to justice at The Hague rather than in Yugoslavia would prove to be complicated. The new Yugoslavian democratic government's persistence on trying Milosevic in Serbia and the ICTY's insistence that it had primacy over Milosevic established the complexity of the issue. The concept on an International Criminal Court arose because of the failure of national courts to bring individuals like Milosevic to trial. On the one hand, to permit Yugoslavia to try Milosevic, at least first, would encourage national courts to deal with such issues. On the other hand, Madam del Ponte's adamance that the ICTY had primacy granted under U.N. Resolutions and should not have to negotiate. She further expressed her concern that Yugoslavia could not be trusted to prosecute Milosevic due to problems of witness intimidation and the Milosevic regime still retaining influence in the Justice system. It is a difficult problem with no easy solution.

I yield the floor.

---

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

---

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

---

#### NOMINATION OF TOMMY G. THOMPSON TO BE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now go into executive session and resume consideration of the nomination of Tommy G. Thompson, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Tommy G. Thompson, of Wisconsin, to be Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 10 minutes each under the control of the Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY; the Senator from Montana, Mr. BAUCUS; and the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I might consume.